



Please place a plus sign (+) inside this box →

AP/2800  
PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

## TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

		Application Number	09/905,398
		Filing Date	7/14/2001
		First Named Inventor	Nace Layadi
		Group Art Unit	2814
		Examiner Name	Mai, Anh D.
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	Layadi 30-23 (001)

RECEIVED  
JUL 18 2001  
1C 2800 MAIL ROOM

### ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application) <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): 1. Post Card  Remarks
--	---	---

### SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	David G. Maire, Esquire Reg. No. 34,865 Beusse, Brownlee, Bowdoin & Wolter, P. A.
Signature	
Date	7/10/03

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date:

Typed or printed name	David G. Maire
Signature	
Date	7/10/03

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PTO/SB/17 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0032  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

# FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2000

Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT** **(\\$) 320.00**

## Complete if Known

Application Number	09/905,398
Filing Date	7/14/2001
First Named Inventor	Nace Layadi
Examiner Name	Mai, Anh D.
Group Art Unit	2814
Attorney Docket No.	Layadi 30-23 (001)

RECEIVED  
JUL 18 2001  
MAILED  
JUL 18 2001

## METHOD OF PAYMENT (check one)

1.  The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayments to:

Deposit Account Number	
Deposit Account Name	

Charge Any Additional Fee Required Under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17

Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

2.  **Payment Enclosed:**

Check  Credit card  Money Order  Other

## FEE CALCULATION (continued)

### 3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Fee Code (\$)	Small Entity Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
105	130	205 65 Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
127	50	227 25 Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
139	130	139 130 Non-English specification	
147	2,520	147 2,520 For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	
112	920*	112 920* Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
113	1,840*	113 1,840* Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
115	110	215 55 Extension for reply within first month	
116	380	216 190 Extension for reply within second month	
117	870	217 435 Extension for reply within third month	
118	1,360	218 680 Extension for reply within fourth month	
128	1,850	228 925 Extension for reply within fifth month	
119	300	219 150 Notice of Appeal	
120	300	220 150 Filing a brief in support of an appeal	320.00
121	260	221 130 Request for oral hearing	
138	1,510	138 1,510 Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
140	110	240 55 Petition to revive - unavoidable	
141	1,210	241 605 Petition to revive - unintentional	
142	1,210	242 605 Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
143	430	243 215 Design issue fee	
144	580	244 290 Plant issue fee	
122	130	122 130 Petitions to the Commissioner	
123	50	123 50 Petitions related to provisional applications	
126	240	126 240 Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
581	40	581 40 Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
146	690	246 345 Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	
149	690	249 345 For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))	
179	690	279 345 Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
169	900	169 900 Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

\* Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

**SUBTOTAL (3) (\\$) 320.00**

Complete (if applicable)

Name (Print/Type)	David G. Maire, Esquire	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	34,865	Telephone	(407) 926-7704
Signature	<i>David G. Maire</i>			Date	7/10/03

**WARNING:** Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7/11/Appeal  
Brief  
7-24-03  
C. Moore

Application of:

Nace Layadi, et al.

Group Art Unit: 2814

Serial No.: 09/905,398

Examiner: Mai, Amh D.

Filed: 7/14/2001

Attorney Docket: Layadi 30-23

Title: POLISH OR ETCH STOP LAYER

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED  
JUL 18 2003  
1C 2800 MAIL ROOM

APPELLANT'S BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 1.192

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed in this application on May 12, 2003.

The fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(c) is paid concurrently with the filing of this brief in accordance with the accompanying Transmittal of Appeal Brief.

This brief is transmitted in triplicate in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(1)

The real party in interest in this appeal is the assignee of the present application, Agere Systems, Inc., a corporation of the State of Delaware.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(2)

There is no other appeal or interference that will directly affect, or that will be directly affected by, or that will have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)

Claims cancelled: 6, 8-17

(Note: two claims were erroneously numbered 16 in the original application.

Because of this mistake, no claim 18 was ever presented in the application).

Claims withdrawn but not cancelled: none.

Claims pending: 1-5, 7, 19-20 and 21.

Claims allowed: none.

Claims rejected: 1-5, 7, 19-20 and 21.

The claims on appeal are 1-5, 7, 19-20 and 21.

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)

No amendment has been entered after the Final Rejection contained in the Office Communication dated 02/11/2003.

5. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)

The invention is a semiconductor structure including a polish etch stop layer disposed over a layer of a dielectric material in order to protect the dielectric material during the polishing of an overlying layer of metal. The polish etch stop layer may be titanium aluminum nitride (claims 1-5 and 7). Alternatively, the polish etch stop layer may be titanium nitride alloyed with carbon and having a hardness which is 30 to 35 percent greater than a hardness of titanium nitride alone (claims 19-20). These embodiments are illustrated in FIGs. 1 and 2, which show the polish stop layer 18 disposed over a dielectric layer 14 and under a metal layer 20. These embodiments are described in the specification at page 4, line 24 through page 5, line 20.

The invention is further a semiconductor structure including a titanium aluminum nitride etch stop layer disposed over a layer of metal in order to protect the metal during the etching of an overlying layer of dielectric (claim 21). This embodiment is illustrated in FIG. 3, which shows the etch stop layer 34 disposed over a metal layer 28 and under a dielectric layer 26. This embodiment is described in the specification at page 5, line 21 through page 6, line 27.

6. ISSUES - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)

(1) Whether claims 19 and 20 are clearly anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Konecni (U.S. patent 6,069,072)?

(2) Whether claims 1-5 and 7 are unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Yamashita (JP patent 08-107148) in view of Meikle (U.S. patent 5,231,306)?

(3) Whether claim 21 is unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Yamashita (JP patent 08-107148) in view of Meikle (U.S. patent 5,231,306)?

7. GROUPING OF CLAIMS - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7)

The appellant agrees that claims 19 and 20 are properly grouped together in the rejection under 35 USC 102(b).

The appellant disagrees that claims 1-5 and 7 should be grouped together with claim 21 in the rejection under 35 USC 103(a). While each of these claims includes the limitation of a titanium aluminum nitride layer, in claims 1-5 and 7 this layer is disposed over a dielectric layer to protect the dielectric layer during the etching of an overlying layer of metal. Conversely, in claim 21 this layer is disposed over a metal layer to protect the metal layer during the polishing of an overlying layer of dielectric. Because the relative positioning of layers of material is technically significant in a semiconductor structure, claims 1-5 and 7 should be grouped separately from claim 21 for purposes of consideration in this appeal.

8. ARGUMENT - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)

Issue 1 - Whether claims 19 and 20 are clearly anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Konecni (U.S. patent 6,069,072)?

Konecni fails to describe the specific claim limitations of "a polish stop layer comprising titanium nitride alloyed with carbon deposited over the dielectric layer and extending into the via" and "a metal layer deposited over the polish stop layer and filling the via."

The only use of titanium nitride alloyed with carbon that is described in Konecni is with respect to the barrier layer 360 of FIG. 3 and layer 230 of FIG. 2B, which are both

disposed above a respective aluminum (metal) plug 330, 220 and which do not extend into the via. Konecni describes this use of titanium nitride alloyed with carbon in this location above the aluminum plug as being for the purpose of electromigration protection. (see column 4, lines 31-42) The Konecni disclosure fails to describe the claimed combination of titanium nitride alloyed with carbon over a dielectric layer and extending into a via below a metal layer for the purpose of a polish stop layer.

Konecni does describes a barrier layer (liner layer) 205 of FIG. 2A that extends into a via. However, Konecni describes this layer as being titanium nitride (see column 3, line 8) and not as being titanium nitride alloyed with carbon. Konecni fails to describe a layer of titanium nitride alloyed with carbon extending into a via over a dielectric layer. Further, the titanium nitride barrier layer 205 of Konecni is not a polish stop layer. That is, Konecni specifically teaches that a portion of that layer disposed outside the via and designated as 205' will be removed during a subsequent CMP process (see column 3, lines 9-11). Accordingly, Konecni teaches away from the claimed polish stop layer.

Konecni also fails to describe the specific claim limitation of "wherein the polish stop layer has a hardness which is 30 to 35 percent greater than a hardness of titanium nitride alone for protecting the dielectric layer from a chemical mechanical polishing process used to remove a portion of the metal layer deposited outside of the via." This is not an inherent characteristic of the titanium nitride alloyed with carbon that is described in Konecni, since Konecni allows the carbon content to reach 30% (column 4, line 36) for the purpose of electromigration protection, whereas the present specification and dependent claim 20 specifically limit the carbon content to no more than 20% for the purpose of a polish stop function.

Issue 2 - Whether claims 1-5 and 7 are unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Yamashita (JP patent 08-107148) in view of Meikle (U.S. patent 5,231,306)?

The Examiner has failed to satisfy the burden of factually supporting the *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness as required under MPEP 2142. The Examiner admits that Yamashita fails to disclose the claim 1 limitation of "wherein said polish stop layer comprises titanium aluminum nitride." The Examiner states "Meikle teaches that TiAlN are known in the art to be used in place of TiN in semiconductor devices" and that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

to form the polish stop layer (31) of Yamashita comprises TiAlN as taught by Meikle because TiAlN material is more resistant to diffusion than TiN."

MPEP 2143.01 provides: The mere fact that references can be combined or modified in hindsight does not render that resultant combination obvious. Rather, the prior art must also suggest the desirability of the combination (*In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). The fact that titanium aluminum nitride is more resistant to diffusion than titanium nitride is not indicative of the relative performance of these two materials during a polishing process. Diffusion is related to porosity of the material whereas polishing performance is related to chemical reactivity and mechanical strength. The fact that Meikle teaches that TiAlN is more resistant to diffusion than TiN provides no motivation for using titanium nitride alloyed with aluminum in place of titanium nitride as a polish stop layer.

*Prima facie* obviousness also requires a reasonable expectation of success. (*In re Clinton*, 188 USPQ 365) Meikle's teaching regarding the performance of TiAlN for preventing interdiffusion of silicon and aluminum at a silicon/aluminum interface provides no basis for any expectation regarding the performance of that material as a polish stop layer.

Furthermore, Meikle states at column 2, lines 35-36 that "TiAlN etches readily in NH<sub>4</sub>OH/H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> similar to TiN." Thus Meikle provides no motivation for using TiAlN in the device of Yamashita in order to improve its polish stop performance, and thus the Examiner has failed to establish a case for *prima facie* obviousness.

Issue 3 - Whether claim 21 is unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Yamashita (JP patent 08-107148) in view of Meikle (U.S. patent 5,231,306)?

The Examiner has failed to satisfy the burden of factually supporting the *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness as required under MPEP 2142.

First, the Examiner describes the teaching of Yamashita and states "wherein the barrier layer (27) function as an etch stop layer. (See Fig. 6)." This is technically incorrect, since layer 27 of Yamashita has clearly been partially etched away during the dielectric-etching step illustrated in FIG. 5. Thus, Yamashita actually teaches that the material of layer 27, which is titanium nitride, will not function as an etch stop layer.

Meikle states at column 2, lines 35-36 that "TiAlN etches readily in NH<sub>4</sub>OH/H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> similar to TiN." Thus Meikle fails to recognize the significantly different etch properties of these two materials.

Accordingly, it is not proper to combine Yamashita and Meikle since the substitution of titanium nitride alloyed with aluminum from Meikle into the layer 27 of Yamashita would interfere with the etching step of FIG. 5 of Yamashita wherein a portion of that layer is intentionally removed. Thus, the combination of the teaching of Meikle into the device of Yamashita would not result in the intended structure of FIG. 6 of Yamashita, thereby destroying the intent of the Yamashita patent.

Claim 21 includes the limitations of "a layer of titanium aluminum nitride disposed on the metal layer" and "wherein the layer of titanium aluminum nitride functions as an etch stop layer upon removal of the selected portion of the dielectric layer to prevent the etching process from compromising the underlying metal layer." The combination of Yamashita and Meikle fails to establish a *prima facie* case for the obviousness of this claimed combination.

9. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)

An appendix containing a copy of the claims involved in this appeal is provided herewith.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Maire, Reg. No. 34,865  
Beusse Brownlee Bowdoin & Wolter, P.A.  
390 North Orange Ave., Suite 2500  
Orlando, FL 32801  
telephone: 407-926-7704

## APPENDIX OF CLAIMS

1. (Amended) A semiconductor structure comprising:  
a substrate having a device feature formed thereon;  
a dielectric layer disposed over said substrate and device feature and having at least one contact hole formed therein;  
a polish stop layer disposed over the dielectric layer and extending within the contact hole;  
a layer of metal disposed over the polish stop layer within the contact hole and forming a plug; and  
wherein said polish stop layer comprises titanium aluminum nitride.
2. (Amended) The semiconductor structure of claim 1 and including a metal coating under said dielectric layer, said metal coating comprising a compound of titanium nitride and aluminum.
3. (Amended) The semiconductor structure of claim 2 wherein the dielectric comprises a silicon oxide.
4. The semiconductor structure of claim 3, wherein the metal coating comprises an anti-reflective coating.
5. (Amended) The semiconductor structure of claim 1, wherein the polish stop layer comprises titanium aluminum nitride with between about 5 and 20 percent by weight of aluminum.
7. The semiconductor structure of claim 2, wherein the metal coating comprises about 5 to 20 percent by weight of aluminum.

19. A semiconductor structure comprising:

- a substrate layer;
- a dielectric layer disposed over the substrate layer and having a via formed therein;
- a polish stop layer comprising titanium nitride alloyed with carbon deposited over the dielectric layer and extending into the via;
- a metal layer deposited over the polish stop layer and filling the via; and
- wherein the polish stop layer has a hardness which is 30 to 35 percent greater than a hardness of titanium nitride alone for protecting the dielectric layer from a chemical mechanical polishing process used to remove a portion of the metal layer deposited outside of the via.

20. The semiconductor structure of claim 19, wherein the polish stop layer comprises titanium nitride alloyed with between 5 and 20 percent by weight carbon.

21. A semiconductor structure comprising:

- a metal layer disposed on a substrate;
- a layer of titanium aluminum nitride disposed on the metal layer;
- a dielectric layer disposed on the layer of titanium aluminum nitride;
- a patterned layer of photoresist disposed on the dielectric layer exposing a selected portion of the dielectric layer to an etching process;
- wherein the layer of titanium aluminum nitride functions as an etch stop layer upon removal of the selected portion of the dielectric layer to prevent the etching process from compromising the underlying metal layer.